RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 0 8 2007

Remarks

This Reply is considered fully responsive to the non-final Office Action mailed October 6, 2006. Claims 1-22 were pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 6, 9-13, 15-16, and 19-22 stand rejected. With this reply, no claims have been amended, no claims have been cancelled, and no new claims have been added. Reexamination and reconsideration are requested.

Allowable Subject matter

The Office Action indicated that claims 5, 7-8, 14, and 17-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicants reserve the right to make such an amendment but believe the base claims of these allowable claims should be allowed in their original form, as argued below. Therefore, claims 5, 7-8, 14, and 17-18 are not amended, and allowance is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office has rejected claims 1-4, 6, 10-13, and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,484, 276 to Singh et al. ("Singh"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the following reasons.

Singh discloses providing extensible fault injection in an object oriented framework. However, Singh fails to disclose or suggest the features recited in claims 1-4, 6, 10-13, and 15-16.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, "receiving a command at a device through a sequencer that controls interactions on a small computer system interface bus". For a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 U.S.C. 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference. *In re Bond*, 15 USPQ2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (emphasis added). However, Singh fails to disclose or suggest receipt of a command through such a sequencer, as Singh does not disclose or suggest a sequencer that controls interactions on a small computer system interface bus. Specifically, Singh makes no reference at all to such a small computer system interface bus (or any bus, for that matter) or such a sequencer. Accordingly, Singh fails to anticipate claim 1. Allowance of claim 1 is therefore requested.

Claims 2-4 and 6 depend from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable. Therefore, claims 2-4 and 6 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Furthermore, Singh fails to disclose or suggest reprogramming of the recited sequencer in claim 2. The WG 504 object of Singh, cited incorrectly by the Office as "GW" in the rejections of claims 2-4, is not disclosed as reprogramming anything but merely as sending messages to a WGRemote 510 object, which starts the workload program. As such, no "reprogramming" of the recited sequencer is disclosed or suggested by Singh. For at least these reasons, allowance of claims 2-4 and 6 is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 recites "a sequencer adapted to be connected to a small computer system parallel interface bus". Again, Singh fails to disclose or suggest such a sequencer that is adapted to be connected to a small computer system parallel interface bus. Furthermore, claim 10 recites "a co-processor . . . capable . . . of providing instructions to the sequencer". The Office submits that the WGRemote 510 object represents the recited sequencer and that the target machine 501 represents the recited co-processor. The Applicants strenuously dispute the Office's interpretation of the claims and the Singh reference in this regard. The WGRemote 510 object does not identically teach the recited sequencer and the target machine 501 does not identically teach the recited co-processor. For example, Singh does not disclose or suggest that the target machine 501 provides instructions to the WGRemote 510 object. As such, Singh and further fails to disclose or suggest the recited co-processor being capable of providing instructions to the recited sequencer and therefore fails to anticipate claim 10. Allowance of claim 10 is therefore requested.

Claims 11-13 and 15-16 depend from claim 10, which is believed to be allowable. Therefore, claims 11-13 and 15-16 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 10. As such, Singh fails to anticipate claims 11-13 and 15-16. Allowance of claims 11-13 and 15-16 is therefore requested.

Furthermore, claim 15 depends from claim 14, which the Office has deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the features of its base claim and any intervening claims. Notwithstanding Applicants' belief that claim 15 is patentable in its current form, as argued above, the Applicants' request that the Office deem claim 15 as allowable as being dependent upon an allowable claim.

The Office has rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,363,379 to Eckenrode et al. ("Eckenrode"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Eckenrode discloses a circuit for injecting errors into an FDDI token ring network. The EI State Machine 54 performs only two modes of error injection: (1) frame status injection and (2) full error injection. Eckenrode, col. 4, lines 11-22.

Claim 19 recites, among other features, "receiving a command to generate a false data miscompare error", which is described in the present application as occurring when "the data that is returned during a read operation is corrupted" (page 2, lines 8-10) and "in which illegal data is returned during the execution of the read command" (page 11, line 14). As discussed, Eckenrode merely discloses an error injector performing two types of error injection and does not specify, disclose, or suggest receiving a command to generate a false miscompare error.

Furthermore, Eckenrode does not disclose or suggest reading data into a memory, changing at least some of the data to form corrupted data, and passing the corrupted data as the data read from the storage medium. Instead, Eckenrode merely transmits good data from one memory (i.e., SHADOW RAM 22) or corrupted data from another memory (i.e., ERROR INJECTION RAM 24). Eckenrode, col. 3, lines16-53 and FIG. 1. Therefore, the recited operations are simply not taught in Eckenrode. Accordingly, Eckenrode fails to anticipate claim 19. Allowance of claim 19 is therefore requested.

The Office has rejected claims 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,471,564 to Dennis et al. ("Dennis"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Dennis discloses processing a dynamic printer timeout condition and specifically, at the paragraph cited by the Office (i.e., Dennis, col. 24, lines 35-58), a prior art method of setting the timeout period, wherein an improperly set timeout period may result in a false error message. In fact, Dennis explains how false error messages are undesirable and provides a solution that is intended to alleviate false error message. Dennis, col. 24, lines 35-58 and col. 25, lines 27-31. However, Dennis fails to disclose or suggest the recited receiving an indication that a false timeout error should be generated during execution of a command. Furthermore, the timeout error message in Dennis indicates satisfaction of a timeout condition, in the prior art discussed by Dennis or in Dennis' described method. However, Dennis does not disclose or suggest stopping

the processing of the command after starting said processing but before completing the command, without indicating that the processing of the command has stopped. In fact, Dennis does not appear to address stopping a command, except to state in some paragraphs that printing cannot be stopped or an error will occur. (e.g., Dennis, col. 15, lines 39-40). Then, if a timeout error does occur, then a timeout error message is generated to indicate this (e.g., Dennis, col. 24, lines 35-58), which does not comply with the recited feature of stopping a command without indicating that the processing of the command has stopped. For at least these reasons, Dennis fails to anticipate claim 20. Allowance of claim 20 is therefore requested.

Claim 21 depends from claim 20, which is believed to be allowable. Therefore, claim 21 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 20. As such, Dennis fails to anticipate claim 21. Allowance of claim 21 is therefore requested.

Claim 22 recites, in part, receiving a command to generate a false error, the command comprising at least one sense parameter. Dennis discloses generating a false error message but does not disclose or suggest a false error comprising a "sense parameter". Furthermore, claim 22 recites a false error message, distinct from the false error itself, wherein the false error message describes the error in part by including the sense parameter. Dennis makes no mention of a false error message including the sense parameter. For at least these reasons, Dennis fails to anticipate claim 22. Allowance of claim 22 is therefore requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office has rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singh in further view of Eckenrode. Claim 9 depends from claim 8, which depends from claim 1. Both claim 1 and claim 8 are believed to be allowable. Therefore, claim 9 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 8. Furthermore, Eckenrode fails to disclose or suggest the recited features missing from Singh. As such, Singh and Eckenrode, both singly and in combination, fail to make claim 9 obvious. Allowance of claim 9 is therefore requested.

Conclusion

The Applicant believes no other fees or petitions are due with this filing. However, should any such fees or petitions be required, please consider this a request therefor and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3199 as necessary.

If the Examiner should require any additional information or amendment, please contact the undersigned attorney. If the Examiner believes any issues could be resolved via a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

1-8-07
Date

Richard J. Hölzer, Jr., Reg. No. 42,668
Attorney for Applicant
USPTO Customer No. 64776

HENSLEY KIM & EDGINGTON, LLC
1660 Lincoln Street, Suite 3050
Denver, Colorado 80264
Tel: 720-377-0770
Fax: 720-377-0777